

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action of January 13, 2009, claims 1 and 3-13 are rejected. In response, claims 1 and 5 have been amended. Applicant hereby requests reconsideration of the application in view of the claim amendments and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, on February 5, 2009, a telephone interview between the undersigned attorney and Examiner Corey Faherty was conducted. In the telephone interview, the proposed amendments to the independent claims 1 and 5 were discussed with respect to the cited prior art. No agreement was reached.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Stolan (U.S. Pat. No. 5,864,663). Claims 4 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stolan in view of Ubicom (Ubicom Product Report –IP2002 Internet Processor, hereafter “Ubicom”). Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stolan in view of Kamiya et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,144,887, hereafter “Kamiya”). Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are patentable over Stolan, Ubicom, and Kamiya for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

As amended, claim 1 recites in part the limitations of “*a reset of the microcontroller unit is caused if a reset condition is detected, wherein the reset condition is transmission of at least one special sequence, particularly at least one drive or access sequence assigned to the reset operation, to the base chip and the reset of the microcontroller unit is confirmed under an enquiry routine by checking whether the at least one special sequence has been successfully transmitted to the base chip,*” which is not disclosed in Stolan. Support for this claim amendment can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, page 6, lines 5-8. Since Stolan does not disclose the above limitations, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Stolan.

In amended claim 1, a reset of a microcontroller unit is caused by two distinct steps. The first step is detecting a reset condition. The subsequent step is confirming the reset of the microcontroller unit under an enquiry routine. Applicant respectfully submits that Stolan does not disclose the subsequent step of confirming the reset of the microcontroller unit under an enquiry routine. With regard to Examiner's concern about flip-flop circuits, Applicant respectfully submits that a flip-flop circuit simply detects an input signal and does not confirm a reset under an enquiry routine.

In amended claim 1, the reset condition is transmission of at least one special sequence, particularly at least one drive or access sequence assigned to the reset operation, to a base chip. The reset of the microcontroller unit is confirmed under an enquiry routine by checking whether the at least one special sequence has been successfully transmitted to the base chip. Stolan discloses that a programming reset signal (40) passes through a line (42) to a multiplexer (26) (see Fig. 1 and column 4, lines 8-11). However, Stolan does not disclose that the programming reset signal (40) includes at least one special sequence.

Because Stolan does not disclose all the limitations of amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Stolan.

Dependent Claims 3-4 and 10-11

Claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the independent claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 3, 4, 10, and 11 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 1.

Independent Claim 5

Claim 5 has been amended to include the limitations of *“at least one reset unit for resetting the microcontroller unit, which reset unit is connected to said microcontroller unit, wherein a reset of the microcontroller unit is caused if a reset condition is detected, wherein the reset condition is transmission of at least one special sequence, particularly at least one drive or access sequence assigned to the reset operation, to the base chip and the reset of the microcontroller unit is confirmed under an enquiry routine by checking whether the at least one special sequence has been successfully transmitted to the base*

chip.” Support for this claim amendment can be found in Applicant’s specification at, for example, page 6, lines 5-8.

As amended, claim 5 includes similar limitations as amended claim 1. Because of the similarities between claim 1 and claim 5, Applicant respectfully asserts that the above remarks with regard to amended claim 1 apply also to amended claim 5. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 5 is not anticipated by Stolan.

Dependent Claims 6-9 and 12-13

Claims 6-9 and 12-13 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of the independent claim 5. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 6-9 and 12-13 are allowable at least based on an allowable claim 5.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1 and 3-13 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3-9 of copending Application No. 10/517,471 in view of Stolan, Ubicom and Kamiya. Applicant notes herein that the alleged double patenting rejections will be addressed at a later time, assuming that these rejections are still applicable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendment and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthias Muth

Date: February 6, 2009

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Reg. No. 43,654

Wilson & Ham

PMB: 348

2530 Berryessa Road

San Jose, CA 95132

Phone: (925) 249-1300

Fax: (925) 249-0111